

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, NORTHERN DIVISION

EDWARD BRAGGS, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.)	2:14cv601-MHT
)	(WO)
JEFFERSON S. DUNN, in his)	
official capacity as)	
Commissioner of)	
the Alabama Department of)	
Corrections, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

The court previously ordered the defendants to clarify what they intended "duplicative, inconsistent, and/or moot" to mean as to each provision referenced in their motion to terminate. See Order (doc. no. 2960). The court also ordered the plaintiffs to respond to the defendants' filing and identify which, if any, of the provisions they agreed should be terminated. *Id.*

After the defendants submitted their filing, the plaintiffs objected on the record during the September 17, 2020, conference call that it did not follow the court's instructions and requested additional time to draft their

response. See Pls.' Summary of Arguments Presented in Court on Sept. 17, 2020 (doc. no. 2971) at 5-6. The court continued the deadline for the plaintiffs' response pending consideration of this argument. See Order (doc. no. 2966).

The court has reviewed the defendants' filing and finds that, overall, it provides sufficient detail for the plaintiffs to understand and respond to defendants' arguments.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the plaintiffs shall submit their response to the court by 12:00 p.m. on September 25, 2020. If the plaintiffs believe that it is impossible for them to respond to the defendants' argument regarding any particular stipulation, they should explain in detail in their response why they are unable to do so.

DONE, this the 23rd day of September, 2020.

/s/ Myron H. Thompson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE